



Evaluation of Chad's interim strategy for education and literacy (*SIPEA*)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

August 2012

Evaluation carried out by Mr Ed. LAMOT

Executive summary

(Executive summary extracted from the full evaluation report in French)

SIPEA¹ and its process of elaboration constitute a positive milestone for the development of Chad's education system. **SIPEA was elaborated on the basis of a thorough process**, including a diagnostic assessment of the education system and the financial modelling of possible scenarios. The diagnostics assessment paints a clear picture of the education system and its challenges. Large consultancies were held across key government departments, with the donors and with civil society organisations. SIPEA's concentration on three sub-sectors (primary education, adult literacy, and basic non formal education) with a capacity building component over a medium term framework (2013-2015) is globally coherent.

The financial model is sector-wide up to 2020 and includes the major parameters necessary for the **development of a theoretically sustainable scenario**. It clearly presents the key trade-offs between sub-sectors and between objectives of increased access and quality of education. SIPEA's formulation document is both concise and accessible, including a set of tools that clarify the strategies and actions proposed for its implementation (logical framework, three-year action plan, summary of the scenario). **Wide consultancies** were held with stakeholders for the elaboration of SIPEA and its underlying tools.

On the whole **SIPEA correctly identifies the strategies necessary** to carry forward the development of the identified sub-sectors and themes, and prepare the ministries to develop a full sector strategic plan by 2016. The Strategy covers the key components necessary for the development of access to education and the development of a quality education: school infrastructure, management of teachers, the administrative and pedagogic management of schools, school feeding programmes, textbooks and teaching aides, etc. SIPEA also covers some of the structural measures needed for the development of the sector. A reference is made to the current shortfall in domestic resources allocated for education and efforts pledged to improve this, as well as the need to move forward on the decentralisation of the education budget in order to fulfil the capacity of the ministry to act locally through its decentralised offices (at regional, departmental and, most of all, at sub-prefectural levels). Lastly, SIPEA recognises the **key areas of capacity building** that are required. The following areas are covered in the strategies: financial management, planning and the development of the education management information system (EMIS); overall management, including the management of human resources.

Naturally, SIPEA is not without some weaknesses. Like most other countries that formulate strategies for the development of education, **most of the weakness lies in the implementation strategies (the "how to")**. There are also **some structural, organisational and budgetary concerns**. However, these weaknesses can be addressed through additional clarification prior to implementation, or as points of attention during implementation.

The overall clarity and accessibility of the Strategy is somewhat hampered by the fact that **the three-year action plan does not encompass the full budgetary framework covering implementation**. The three-year budgeted action plan (*PATB*²) only covers 34.8% of the total cost of SIPEA; the plan tends to focus too exclusively on outside resources and does not sufficiently take into account the national Budget³. This is at odds with the fact that domestic resources account for the largest portion of funding

¹ *Stratégie intérimaire pour l'éducation et l'alphabétisation* – interim strategy for education and literacy

² *Plan d'action triennal budgétisé*

³ NB : This is a weakness of several country sector strategic plans, not just Chad's SIPEA

for SIPEA (79%). Key measures for the development of the Strategy, including the decentralisation of the education budget or the increased subsidy for community teachers, need to be included and budgeted in the three-year action plan.

The strategy for the expansion of school construction through community contracting constitutes a challenge. Local communities such as parent associations need complex and costly support in order to contract out and supervise school construction. This strategy has hitherto been piloted by an externally funded project approach; scaling up this strategy will be difficult. SIPEA could usefully try to initiate some thought into structural options for the longer term, notably by making use of projected State reforms in devolution and the setting up of local government institutions (possibilities for the contracting of school construction by local government).

Decentralisation for education management is a major point of concern. Without the effective decentralisation of budget allocations towards the local offices of the Ministry of education, it will be impossible for the State to act locally and supervise the school system. SIPEA raises this concern, but may not pay sufficient attention to it at an operational level. Budgets are targeted towards training for the decentralised offices of the ministry and the elaboration of management manuals, but concrete decentralised budget allocation targets have not been set in the Strategy.

The strategies and targets for the expansion in adult literacy are ambitious, particularly in a context of traditionally poor effectiveness and poor efficiency of this sub-sector. Significant budgets have been identified to implement a new strategy using contracted operators for adult literacy campaigns, but the sources for these new budgets have not been clearly identified in the three-year action plan.

The areas identified for **capacity building** are relevant, even if the management of procurement has been largely left out. However, the **strategies identified for the building of capacity probably need further consideration.** These strategies are largely confined to the provision of technical assistance and the elaboration of management manuals. Further reflexion could be used to develop strategies more attuned towards the realities and requirements of the ministry, particularly in the area of financial management.

The implementation of SIPEA will be highly dependent on the capacity of the ministry, to implement its budget and to coordinate external resources. The coordination of parallel implementation units is a challenge for the ministry. The process of annual planning is one way to facilitate this coordination, by allowing greater transparency in the resources allocated towards education outputs and outcomes (access, quality and management). This process has started, with a 2012 annual action plan and the three-year work plan of SIPEA, but both these planning tools consolidate only a fraction of the total resources for the sector. It is important for the ministry to develop a consolidated annual planning framework, covering the whole budget and able to serve as a basis for technical and financial reporting on outputs, results and outcomes.